

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 6 of 11

RECEIVED  
SEP 27 2006

**REMARKS:**

These remarks are in response to the non-final Office Action mailed June 29, 2006, in which claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-25 stand rejected.

In the instant application claims 1 and 11 are independent. In the present response claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitation of claims 2-4 that the base comprises a thermoplastic material and the shaving aid body comprises a soap material. Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of 18 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material. Claim 2-4, 17 and 18 have been cancelled. No new matter was entered in making these amendments.

As independent claims 1 and 11 as currently amended now recite the subject matter of previously presented claims 4 and 18 the Examiner's rejection of claims 4 and 18 will be addressed first.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 as it applies to amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Yin et al (US Patent number 5,711,076, hereinafter referred to as "Yin").

In making the rejection the Examiner alleges that Conrad, Jr. shows the process as claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. The Examiner concedes that Conrad, Jr. does not show a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material. The Examiner goes on to allege that Yin shows that it is known to carry out a method for making a shaving aid cartridge wherein the shaving aid body comprises a soap material (Col 4, lines 49-56).

The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the disclosure and teachings of Yin. The disclosure of Yin is directed to:

A shaving system that includes a housing, one or more blades mounted on the housing, a cap behind the blades on the housing, and a guard structure in front of the blades on the housing, the guard structure including flexible skin-engaging protrusions that engage a user's skin in front of the blades and a water leachable shaving aid composite positioned to deliver a shaving aid to the skin behind the flexible skin-engaging protrusions.

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 7 of 11

At Col 4, lines 14-20, Yin discloses the composition of his shaving aid composite:

Shaving aid composites 24, 36, 46, 52 preferably comprise a matrix of a water-insoluble polymer and, dispersed within the matrix, a skin lubricating water-soluble polymer. Alternatively, the shaving aid composite may comprise a sheath of water-insoluble polymer (e.g., the cavity defining component in FIG. 5) that surrounds a core which includes a skin-lubricating water-soluble polymer.

The Applicants concede that Yin's use of the word "preferably" in this context does not exclude the use of other materials. However, Yin is entirely silent regarding other shaving aid compositions thus the Applicants contend that the disclosure and teaching of Yin is solely directed to shaving aid composites comprising a water insoluble polymer, that may be a matrix or a sheath, and a skin lubricating water-soluble polymer that may be within the matrix or is a core surrounded by the sheath. A soap material, as recited in amended claim 1 is not a polymeric material. The Examiner alleges that Yin, at Col 4, lines 49-56, discloses a shaving aid (body) that comprises a soap material. The Applicants contend that Yin *in toto* and particularly the recitation identified by the Examiner, repeated as follows for convenience, fails to disclose, teach or suggest soap material.

The shaving aid composite may also optionally include an inclusion complex of a skin-soothing agent with a cyclodextrin, low molecular weight water-soluble release enhancing agents such as polyethylene glycol (e.g., 1-10% by weight), water-swellaable release enhancing agents such as cross-linked polyacrylics (e.g., 2-7% by weight), colorants, antioxidants, preservatives, microbicidal agents, beard softeners, astringents, depilatories, medicinal agents, conditioning agents, cooling agents, etc.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under Yin or to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that Yin shows that it is known to carry out a method for making a shaving aid cartridge wherein the shaving aid body comprises a soap material.

The disclosure of Sorensen is directed to a method of cyclic injection molding that enables production of four or more plastic products in each production cycle. The disclosure of Sorensen is entirely directed to plastic (i.e. polymeric) materials and fails to disclose, teach or suggest use of a soap material.

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 8 of 11

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The Applicants contend that Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Yin, individually or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body comprising a soap material as claimed in claim 1 of the present application. The Applicants therefore contend that claim 1 is allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Yin.

The Examiner rejected claim 18 as it applies to amended claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Vreeland et al (hereinafter Vreeland), further in view of Yin.

In making the rejection the Examiner concedes that Conrad does not show a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material. For at least the reasons stated above the Applicants contend that Yin fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material and thus fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen. The disclosure of Vreeland is directed to a shaving aid for use with a wet razor comprising a water insoluble polymeric material including at least two different polymers, and a water soluble active ingredient, such as polyethylene oxide. The disclosure of Vreeland fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material. The Applicants therefore contend that Conrad, Jr., Sorensen, Vreeland and Yin, individually or in combination fail to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body comprising a soap material as claimed in claim 11 of the present application. The Applicants therefore contend that claim 11 is allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr., Sorensen, Vreeland and Yin.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 19-20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. in view of Sorensen.

In the present application claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended as mentioned previously. The deficiencies of Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen as these apply to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material have also

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 9 of 11

been mentioned previously. The Applicants therefore contend that claims 1, 5-8, 11, 19-20 and 24 are allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr., in view of Sorensen. The rejection of claims 2-3 is moot in light of the cancellation of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-10, 14, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Vreeland.

In the present application claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended as mentioned previously. The deficiencies of Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland as these apply to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material have also been mentioned previously. The Applicants therefore contend that claims 9-10, 14, and 21 are allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen in view of Vreeland. The rejection of claim 17 is moot in light of the cancellation of this claim.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Brown.

In the present application claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended as mentioned previously. The deficiencies of Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen as these apply to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material have also been mentioned previously. The disclosure of Brown is directed to methods and devices for manufacturing razor cartridges using insert molding. The Applicants contend that disclosure of Brown on its own fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material and thus fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen with regard to this recitation. The Applicants therefore contend that claims 12 and 13 are allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen in view of Brown.

The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Vreeland, further in view of Reischl.

In the present application claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended as mentioned previously. The deficiencies of Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland as these apply

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 10 of 11

to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material have also been mentioned previously. The disclosure of Reischl is directed to:

Polyaddition products containing urethane groups are produced by reacting an isocyanate group containing distillation residue with a compound having a molecular weight less than 600 containing at least two alcoholic hydroxyl groups. The distillation residue is obtained in the commercial production of tolylene diisocyanate. The distillation residue and hydroxyl compound are reacted in amounts such that the NCO/OH equivalent ratio is less than 1.5:1. The polyaddition reaction is carried out at a temperature in the range of 50° to 220° C. The reaction is carried out in a reaction screw extruder preferably having self-cleaning screw geometry. The polyaddition products are useful as molding compositions, reactive fillers and starting materials in the production of flame-resistant polyurethane plastics.

The Applicants contend that disclosure of Reischl on its own fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material and thus fails to correct the deficiencies of Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland with regard to this recitation. The Applicants therefore contend that claims 15 and 16 are allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland in view of Reischl.

The Examiner rejected claims 22, 23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Conrad, Jr. and Sorensen, in view of Vreeland, further in view of Brams.

In the present application claims 1 and 11 are independent and have been amended as mentioned previously. The deficiencies of Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland as these apply to the recitation of claims 1 and 11 that the shaving aid body comprises a soap material have also been mentioned previously. The disclosure of Brams is directed to:

After a thermoplastic synthetic resin has been injection molded onto a transfer plate in a thermoplastic injection mold, the transfer plate is shifted into a silicone injection mold maintained at a high temperature and a silicone member is injection molded onto the thermoplastic member. The heat transfer to the thermoplastic body is minimized by, for example, providing insulating material between heated portions of the mold system and other portions thereof and/or by maintaining air gaps from which the silicone is excluded between the thermoplastic member and heated portions of the silicone injection mold.

The Applicants contend that disclosure of Brams on its own fails to disclose, teach or suggest a shaving aid body that comprises a soap material and thus fails to correct the



RECEIVED  
GENERAL MAIL CENTER  
SEP 27 2006

Application No. 10/626,989  
Response Dated September 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2006  
Page 11 of 11

deficiencies of Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland with regard to this recitation. The Applicants therefore contend that claims 22, 23 and 25 are allowable and respectfully requested the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Conrad, Jr., Sorensen and Vreeland in view of Brams.

**Summary:**

In summary, the Applicants believe that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the present application be passed onto allowance.

The Applicants believe that no additional fees are due with the filing of the present response, however, if any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account Deposit Account No 503342 maintained by the Attorneys of the Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
David C. Coffin  
Registration No. 57,908

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP  
306 Industrial Park Road, Suite 206  
Middletown, CT 06457-1532  
Phone: (860) 632-7200  
Fax: (860) 632-8269